



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,578	01/21/2004	Alexander Falk	Altova-0001	3475

54975 7590 09/19/2006

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
10 ST. JAMES AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02116

EXAMINER

THERIAULT, STEVEN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/761,578	Applicant(s) FALK ET AL.	
	Examiner Steven B. Theriault	Art Unit 2179	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Steven B. Theriault. (3) Joel Green.
 (2) Alexander Faulk. (4) Ba Huynh.

Date of Interview: 30 August 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: Reply to office action mailed 05/17/2006.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 15 and 20.


Identification of prior art discussed: Lloyd et al. (20050132284).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant requested and in-person interview with the Examiner to discuss the limitations of the independent claims and the non-final rejection mailed 05/17/2006. The applicant presented arguments stating that the prior art of Lloyd does not anticipated the present application. The Examiner reviewed the interpretation of the limitations of the claims and the prior art and provided input into the claims where in terms of a broad reasonable interpretation the claims read on the specified scope of the prior art. No agreement was reached regarding the interpretation of the prior art or the allowability of the amended claims. The examiner also stated that any changes in scope to the claims in response to the interview would be subject to further search and consideration by the examiner. The applicant stated their intent to provide, via an RCE, information to address the Rule 105 issues, defects to 131&132 affidavits, and scope of the claims.

United States Patent and Trademark Office

<u>Application No.</u>	10/761,578
<u>Filing Date</u>	01/21/2004
<u>Inventor</u>	Falk et al.
<u>Examiner</u>	Theriault, S
<u>Art Unit</u>	05/17/2996



Reply To Office Action dated
05/17/2006

Agenda

During this meeting, Applicant intends to address the following:

1. Arguments that claims 1-20 are not anticipated by US Patent Publication 20050132284 ("Lloyd").
2. Arguments and evidence that claims 1, 15 and 20 are not anticipated by the applicable Altova's StyleVision or XMLSpy User and Reference Manuals. Altova references postdated public disclosure and sale of the invention. Application filed within 12 months of public disclosure.
3. Present additional information/evidence with respect to the release of the software on January 22, 2003 with the claimed features present there via a demonstration of the software and screenshots
4. Present information such as purchase orders, invoices and confirmation keycode emails to show that customers could not purchase or StyleVision V5R3 or XMLSpy V5R3 licenses prior to the release date of January 22, 2003

1. Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by US Patent Publication 20050132284 (“Lloyd”)

Claim 1 - Applicant Claim/Element

1. In a data processing system having a windows-based graphical user interface (GUI), the improvement comprising:

an integrated visual design environment having a first display panel in which a structured data source is displayed, and a second display panel for displaying a document being designed from the structured data source;

Examiner (Cited basis for rejection):

[Lloyd 0016] All of the above functionality is generally user-specifiable. In yet another embodiment of the present invention, such user specification may be accomplished through one or more graphic user interfaces (GUIs) specifically configured to simplify the creation of a multi-purpose stylesheet for a user.

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd - Continued

Applicant's Response/Argument

- Applicant claims a single GUI having a first display and second display. Specific elements are claimed in the first display of the single GUI and specific elements are claimed in the second display of the same single GUI. More specifically, applicant claims a structured data source is displayed in the first display of the single GUI, and displaying a document being designed from the structured data source of the first display in the second display.
- Claims 1, 15 and 20 recite "a first display panel in which a structured data source is displayed, and a second display panel for displaying a document being designed from the structured data source," or similar language. Lloyd fails to disclose or describe at least this claim feature.
- Lloyd is very different from applicant's claim invention. Lloyd is all about dialog boxes. As is known to those skilled in this art, dialog boxes are special windows which are used by computer programs to display information to the user and to get a response. They are so-called because they form a dialog between the computer and the user, e.g., requesting input from the user.
- None of Lloyd's GUIs, with or without dialog boxes, disclose or describe an integrated visual design environment displaying a document being designed from the structured data source of the first display in the second display. Lloyd's dialog boxes are merely functions of a stylesheet editor.

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd -Continued

Claim 1 (Element 1)

1. In a data processing system having a windows-based graphical user interface (GUI), the improvement comprising:

an integrated visual design environment having a first display panel in which a structured data source is displayed, and a second display panel for displaying a document being designed from the structured data source;

Examiner (Cited Basis For Rejection):

[Lloyd 0086] A user may create, edit, or otherwise modify a multi-purpose stylesheet in accordance with the present invention through the use of a graphical user interface (GUI) associated with an embodiment of the present invention. The GUI Layer may use the Single Document Interface (SDI) for the main window. Normally, an SDI application comprises four visible objects: the main frame window (CFrameWnd), a toolbar (CToolBar), the view (Cview), and a status bar at the bottom (CstatusBar). In the embodiment shown in FIG. 2, 12 and 13, Styler's main window base class, StylerFrameWnd, derives from the MFC CFrameWnd class. Thus, as shown, Styler comprises three splitter dialog windows. The splitter windows, StylerTreeView 210, StylerDescriptionView 212, and StylerPropView 214 are derived from StylerView which is a subclass of MFC's CformView class.

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd Continued

Applicant's Response/Argument

- Lloyd discloses one or more graphical user interfaces (GUIs) and one or more dialog boxes. For example, Lloyd's FIGs. 2, 12 and 13 disclose a user interface 20 having a StyleTreeView dialog box 210, StyleDescriptionView dialog box 212, and StylePropView dialog box 214. More particularly, Lloyd discloses:
 - [Lloyd 0087] StyleTreeView 210 displays the top splitter window where the element 22 and styler 26 tree controls are displayed. StyleDescriptionView 212 displays the middle splitter window where the description text is displayed. Typically, the information displayed in StyleDescriptionView 212 is read-only text description information of the currently selected item(s) in the top tree controls. StylePropView 214 displays the bottom splitter window where the properties are displayed. The StylePropView 214 manages displaying and modifying of properties associated with the selected item(s) in the top tree controls. [Lloyd, paragraph 0087]

20 (User Interface)




FIGURE 2

[0021] FIG. 2 is a screenshot of a user interface of an editor in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention.

[0053] FIG. 2 is a screenshot of a user interface 20 showing element tags 22, context tags 24, style tags 26, and output-based style editors 28.

[0086] A user may create, edit, or otherwise modify a multi-purpose styled element in accordance with the present invention through the use of a graphical user interface (GUI) associated with an embodiment of the present invention. The GUI Layer may use the Single Document Interface (SDI) for the main window. Normally, an SDI application comprises four visible objects: the main frame window (CMainFrame), a toolbar (CToolBar), the view (CView), and a status bar at the bottom (CStatusBar). In the embodiment shown in FIG. 2, 12 and 13, Styler's main window base class, StylerFrameWnd, derives from the MFC CFrameWnd class. Thus, as shown, Styler comprises three splitter dialog windows. The splitter windows, StylerTreeView 210, StylerDescriptionView 212, and StylerPropView 214 are derived from StylerView which is a subclass of MFC's CFormView class.

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd - Continued

Applicant Response/Argument

Lloyd **still fails** to disclose or describe "a first display panel in which a structured data source is displayed, and a second display panel for displaying a document being designed from the structured data source." Accordingly, claims 1, 15 and 20 are not anticipated by Lloyd.

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd - Continued

Claim 1 – Applicant Claim/Element

In a data processing system having a windows-based graphical user interface (GUI), the improvement comprising: an integrated visual design environment having a first display panel in which a structured data source is displayed, and a second display panel for displaying a document being designed from the structured data source;

code responsive to selection and positioning in the second display panel of given design elements or attributes from the structured data source for generating a meta stylesheet; and

Examiner (Cited Basis For Rejection):

[Lloyd 0033] FIG. 14 is a screenshot of editing stylesheet file source code in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. [Lloyd, paragraph 0033]

[Lloyd 0081] The process of the present invention further enables developer customizations for specific elements/contexts and outputs while maintaining Styler control of all other elements/contexts/outputs. The multi-purpose stylesheet allows extended customization beyond formatting. Editing the element source enables developers to provide additional capabilities while still allowing all other elements and outputs to be modified by the multi-purpose stylesheet. As shown in FIG. 13, to edit the element source, the element source is identified (e.g., XSL-HTML file, XSL-FO, XSL-HTML Help, XSL-Web, XSL-Contributor, or FOSI). An example of editing an XSL-HTML file source is shown in FIG. 14. In FIG. 14, the "copyright" element 170 of an HTML File output is edited. An example of editing an XSL-HTML file source is shown in FIG. 14. In FIG. 14, the "copyright" element 170 of an HTML File output is edited. [Lloyd, paragraph 0081]

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd - Continued

Applicant's Response/Argument:

- As described above, claims 1, 15 and 20 recite a single GUI having a first display and second display. Specific elements are claimed in the first display of the single GUI and specific elements are claimed in the second display of the same single GUI. More specifically, applicant claims a structured data source is displayed in the first display of the single GUI, and displaying a document being designed from the structured data source of the first display in the second display. Claims 1, 15 and 20 recite "code responsive to selection and positioning in the second display panel of given design elements or attributes from the structured data source for generating a meta stylesheet," or similar language. Lloyd fails to disclose or describe at least this claim feature.
- The examiner, to applicant's bewilderment, ignores the elements of this claim feature and argues that Lloyd's FIG. 14 and his single multipurpose stylesheet anticipate applicant's meta stylesheet.




FIGURE 14

Lloyd Figure 14

[0033] FIG. 14 is a screenshot of editing stylesheet file source code in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention.
 [0083] Finally, the output styling process terminates in end operation 140 such as a save operation.
 [0081] ...An example of editing an XSL-HTML file source is shown in FIG. 14. In FIG. 14, the "copyright" element 170 of an HTML File output is edited.

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd - Continued

- Applicant's claim specifies selection and positioning in the second display, i.e., the display containing the document being designed from the structured data source, given design elements or attributes from the structured data source, which is displayed in the first display, for generating a meta stylesheet. No where does Lloyd disclose or describe these features.
- Lloyd's FIG. 14 merely discloses a file source, as indicated in paragraph 0081 and cited by the examiner. Lloyd fails to disclose or describe any selection and positioning.
- Lloyd's FIG. 14 furthermore only discloses editing of one particular file source (e.g. XSL-HTML) to provide additional capabilities, as indicated in paragraph 0081. Lloyd fails to describe or disclose generating a meta stylesheet.
- Accordingly, claims 1, 15 and 20 are not anticipated by Lloyd.

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd -Continued

Claim 15 - Applicant Claim/Element

15. A data processing system having a windows-based graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:
- a display environment having a first display panel in which a structured data source is displayed, and a second display panel for displaying a document being designed from the structured data source, wherein the data source is selected from a set of data sources including: an XML document, an XML schema, a DTD, an EDI document, a relational database, and a Web service

Examiner (Cited Basis For Rejection):

The Examiner raises the same bases for rejection as set forth earlier with respect to Claim 1.

Applicant Response/Arguments

The applicant submits response/arguments set forth above with respect to Claim 1.

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd -Continued

Claim 20 - Applicant Claim/Element(s)

20. A display method operative in a data processing system having a windows-based graphical user interface (GUI), comprising: **displaying, in juxtaposition, a structured data source and a document being designed from the structured data source**, wherein the data source is selected from a set of data sources including: an XML document, an XML schema, a DTD, an EDI document, a relational database, and a Web service; responsive to selection and positioning in the document being designed of given design elements or attributes from the structured data source, generating given program code; automatically generating from the given program code two or more program code instances, wherein each of the program code instances is useful for generating the document being designed in a given output format;

Examiner (Cited Basis For Rejection):

The Examiner raises the same bases for rejection as set forth earlier with respect to Claim 1.

Applicant Response/Arguments

The applicant submits response/arguments set forth above with respect to Claim 1.

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd -Continued

Claim 20 - Applicant Claim/Element

20. A display method operative in a data processing system having a windows-based graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:

selectively displaying a preview of an output document rendered as a result of applying a given one of the program code instances.

Examiner (Cited Basis For Rejection):

[Lloyd 0037] FIG. 18 is a screenshot of user options for exporting to a specific stylesheet language for use in other applications in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention.

[Lloyd 0082] FIG. 18 illustrates a dialog box 200 showing user options for exporting to a specific output. Based upon the multi-purpose stylesheet (a single style file), multiple, target-specific stylesheet languages may be exported. Thus, a single user interface and a single style file may be used to output, for example, XSLT for a flat HTML file, XSLT for an MS HTML Help file, XSLT for Web output, XSL-FO for Print output, FOSI (DOD standard for SGML formatting) for print and editing in Epic Editor, XSLT for editing in Contributor, .wstyle for editing in Companion (add-in to MS Word 2003), or other outputs. The listed outputs are intended to be illustrative, not limiting.

[Lloyd 0083] Finally, the output styling process terminates in end operation 140 such as a save operation. [Lloyd 0033] FIG. 14 is a screenshot of editing stylesheet file source code in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. [Lloyd 0081] ...An example of editing an XSL-HTML file source is shown in FIG. 14. In FIG. 14, the "copyright" element 170 of an HTML File output is edited

Arguments that Claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Lloyd -Continued

Applicant Response/Arguments

- › As disclosed in Lloyd above, FIG. 18 is a dialog box and has nothing to do with selectively displaying a preview of an output document rendered as a result of applying a given one of the program code instances, as claimed in claim 20.

[Lloyd 0037] FIG. 18 is a screenshot of user options for exporting to a specific stylesheet language for use in other applications.

- › Further, as disclosed in Lloyd, FIG. 14 is a screenshot of editing stylesheet file source, and has nothing to do with selectively displaying a preview of an output document rendered as a result of applying a given one of the program code instances, as claimed in claim 20.

[Lloyd0033] FIG. 14 is a screenshot of editing stylesheet file source code in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention.

- › Lloyd's dialog box merely shows user options for exporting to a specific output. Based upon the multi-purpose stylesheet (a single style file), multiple, target-specific stylesheet languages may be exported.
- › Applicant's claim recites "a preview of an output document rendered as a result of applying a given one of the program code instances." Lloyd fails to disclose or describe this claim feature. Accordingly, claim 20 is not anticipated by Lloyd.

2. **Arguments and evidence that claims 1, 15 and 20 are not anticipated by the applicable Altova's Stylevision or XMLSpy User and Reference Manuals.**

Applicant Claims 1, 15, 20

Examiner (Cited Basis For Rejection):

Altova Stylevision 5 User Reference Manual pages 271, 275, 279, 280, 328, 361, 369

Applicant's Response/Argument:

- As further detailed in Applicants/Co-Inventors' Affidavit under 37 CFR §1.131, the Stylevision and XMLSpy User References and Manuals for Version 5 Release 3 and Version 5 Release 4 were published on January 27, 2003 and April 8, 2003 respectively.

Altova references postdated public disclosure and sale of the invention. Application filed within 12 months of public disclosure.

3. Altova Stylevision V5 Release 3 Demo and Screenshots Showing Claimed Functionality

- › Altova Stylevision Version 5 Release 3 software and XMLSPY Version 5, Release 3 software were released on January 22, 2003 8:30 am and 9:00 AM EST.
- › Prior to launch, the final executables of the above were digitally signed and authenticated on January 21, 2003 at 10:51pm and 10:49 pm
- › The new functionality included: • PDF support for Document Publishing – XMLSPY's stylesheet designer now supports visual editing and generation of eXtensible Stylesheet Language Formatting Object (XSL:FO) code, which enables XML content to be rendered into a PDF file. **Now, with a single stylesheet design, developers can preview the output of a stylesheet transformation in either PDF or HTML.** Usability Enhancements for Stylesheet Designer: Improved drag/drop functionality in Stylesheet Designer.

Altova Stylevision Version 5 Release 3 Screenshot

Altova Stylevision Version 5 Release 3 Screenshot

File Edit Insert Table Authentic HTML Import Properties Tools Help

Normal B I U

Design | Document | XSLT StySheet | HTML Preview | XSL-FO | PDF Preview

Employee Directory

Company Logo

Office Name (contents)

Address

Street: contents

City: contents

State/ZIP: AK contents

Phone: contents

Fax: contents

E-Mail: contents

Text Style


Color	Text	Position	Layout	More	IE
	font-family	Arial			
	font-size	medium			
	font-style				
	font-variant				
	font-weight	bold			
	text-decoration				
	text-transform				

Block Style

Color	Text	Position	Layout	More	IE
	background-color				
	background-attachment				
	background-image				
	background-position				
	background-positionX				
	background-positionY				

Done

Altova Stylevision Version 5 Release 3 Screenshot – Drag & Drop



File Edit Insert Table Authentic HTML Import Properties Tools Help

Heading 1 (h1) B I U 80%

OrgChart

- CompanyLogo
- Name
- Office
- Desc
- Address
- ipocname
- ipocstreet
- ipoccity
- ipocstate
- ipoczip
- Phone
- Fax
- FMail

TEXT STYLE

Color	Text	Position	Layout	More
	font-size			
	font-style			
	font-variant			
	font-weight			

BLOCK STYLE

Color	Text	Position	Layout	More
	background-color			
	background-attach			
	background-image			
	background-position			

Design [Document] XSLT Stylesheet HTML Preview XSL-FO PDF Preview

Nanonull Employee Directory

Nanonull, Inc.

Street: 119 Oakstreet, Suite 4876
City: Vereno
State/ZIP: DC29213

Phone: +1 (321) 555 5155
Fax: +1 (321) 555 5155 - 9
E-Mail: office@nanonull.com

Store
Support

The company was established in Vereno, in 1995 and is privately held. Nanonull has been actively involved in developing nanoelectronic software technologies since 1996 and released the first version of its products in February 1999.

Due to the fact that nanoelectronic software components are so small that nobody can see it the company is not well known to the public.

Administration

First	Last	Title	Ext	EMail
Vernon	Callaby	Office Manager	582	v.callaby@nanonull.com
Frank	Further	Accounts Receivable	471	f.further@nanonull.com
Loby	Matise	Accounting Manager	963	l.matise@nanonull.com

4. Stylevision Version 5 Release 3 and XMLSpy Version 5 Release 3 Were Not Available for Purchase Or Otherwise Prior to January 22, 2003

- › As can be seen from Altova Accounts Receivable Binder (containing invoices, order confirmations and keycode emails for January 1-31 2003, customers were only able to purchase licenses for Version 5 Release 3 software after the release date of January 22, 2003